

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/612,968   | 07/07/2003  | Takao Miyazaki        | Q76146              | 4709             |
| 7590 03/24/2005<br>SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC |             |                       | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |             |                       | NOLAN JR, CHARLES H |                  |
| 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3202      |             | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER |                     |                  |
| •  |             |                       | 2854                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |  |   | A   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| ·  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | 10/612,968   | MIYAZAKI, TAKAO   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Charles H. Nolan, Jr.  | 2854  |   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   | ears on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence add  | ress  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 25 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS   | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F   | OR ALLOWANCE.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1 application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (application condition for allowance; (2) in compliance time periods:   | ) an amendment, affidavit, or other peal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu   | evidence, which plac<br>e with 37 CFR 41.31;  | es the<br>or (3) a  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b)  he period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the</li> </ul>  | visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th   |   | er is later. In no  |  |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(   | ). ONLY CHECK BOX (Ь) WHEN THE F<br>f).  | IRST REPLY WAS FILE   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened si above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  | and the corresponding amount of the fee.<br>tatutory period for reply originally set in the  | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)   | on fee under 37<br>as set forth in (b)                                  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appwas filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS  | 41.37 must be filed within two mon<br>CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o  | ths of the date of filing<br>of the appeal. Since a   | the Notice of   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection         <ul> <li>They raise new issues that would require further or</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beleace)</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in beappeal; and/or</li> </ul> </li> </ol>  | onsideration and/or search (see NC<br>ow);   | TE below);  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))   |  | ejected claims.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.   | 121. See attached Notice of Non-C  | ompliant Amendment  | (PTOL-324).   |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s  | 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s).   | allowable if submitted in a separate   | , timely filed amendm   | nent canceling  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  | )  | ill be entered and an   | explanation of  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |   | •   |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  | and be described to the second |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | nd sufficient reasons why the affida   | Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u><br>vit or other evidence i   | not be entered<br>is necessary  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe<br>ry and was not earlier presented. S   | al and/or appellant fa<br>See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(  | ils to provide a<br>1).   |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr | on of the status of the claims after o   | entry is below or attac   | ched.   |  |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by Applicat has argued that the Examiner should have give Applicant further argues that the wherein clause contain disagrees. The invention of Claim 21 is a bag. While the bag. Applicant argues that the bag of Kimura is not been over or double up so that one part lies on top of a published in 1994). The bag of Kimura is clearly bent or  | en the language recited after "when<br>ns additional "features" not elsewhe<br>te "mark" is a feature of a bag, wha<br>folded as recited in Claim 25. The<br>unother part" (see Webster's II New   | ein" in Claim 21 pater<br>ere found in the claim.<br>t the mark does is not<br>common definition of<br>Riverside University I | ntable weight. The Exmainer t a "feature" of "folded" is "to Dictionary |  |  |  |  |

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

figure 2.

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Application No.
Charles H Nolan, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Phil 2884

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 9-04)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 031905